

REMARKS

Claims 1-13, 15-22, and 24-26 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, 19, 24, and 26 have been amended. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 12-13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0128920 to Chopra ("Chopra") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,838,906 to Doyle et al. ("Doyle"). Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Chopra and Doyle fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 12, namely, at least one processor executing a stored interactive software application inside a browser on a client computing system, the executed interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system.

Chopra discloses a method and system for facilitating lowest cost purchasing of products and/or services. The system includes a computer system configured to receive an order from a customer for a plurality of products or services. The computer system receives the order and electronically searches for prices for each of the products and/or services in the order. The computer system then groups the products and/or services into one or more groups and determines one or more sources or vendors that can provide the one or more groups at a lowest purchase cost.

Doyle discloses a system allowing a user of a browser program on a computer connected to an open distributed hypermedia system to access and execute an embedded program object. The program object is embedded into a hypermedia document much like data objects. The user may select the program objects from a screen. Once selected, the program object executes on the user's (client) computer or may execute on a remote server or additional remote computers in a distributed processing arrangement.

The Office action asserts that Chopra fails to teach "the interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element outside the browser operating on the client computing system when executed and wherein at least one element includes a

component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system". See Office Action, p. 3. The Office action asserts that Doyle discloses these features. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In contrast to claim 12, there is no teaching or suggestion by Doyle of executing a stored interactive software application inside a browser on a client computing system, the executed interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system. Doyle discloses interaction between a web browser client and a component embedded in the web browser client which may be, for example, a Java applet. The interaction between the web browser client and the component embedded in the web browser as disclosed in Doyle is distinctly different from an interactive software application and a browser being in communication with at least one element, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser (i.e., a different client side execution process) as claimed in independent claim 12. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 12 distinguishes over the combination of Chopra and Doyle and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 12 is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Chopra and Doyle fails to disclose wherein communication between the interactive software application and the at least one element does not pass through the client side firewall. Chopra fails to disclose a client side firewall. Doyle teaches communications between a client computer and other computers via a network which may be, for example, the Internet. Since the communication as disclosed in Doyle utilizes the Internet, the communication between the plurality of computers penetrates through a client side firewall. In contrast, the claimed invention discloses communications between an interactive software application and at least one element does not pass through a client side firewall. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 12 distinguishes over the combination of Chopra and Doyle and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 13 and 15 depend from and further restrict independent claim 12 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 12, dependent claims 13 and 15 distinguish

over Chopra and Doyle and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 13 and 15 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11, 14, and 16-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chopra in view of Doyle and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0169980 to Brownell ("Brownell"). Dependent claims 14 and 23 were previously canceled, thus rendering the rejections thereof moot.

Independent claim 1 discloses a method for providing security to a client computing system in communication with a host communication system across a network. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 1, namely, executing an interactive software application in a browser on a client computing system, the interactive software application being in communication with at least one element on a client side of a client side firewall, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system.

The Office action asserts that the cited combination of Chopra and Brownell fail to teach "the interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element outside the browser operating on the client computing system when executed and wherein at least one element includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system". See Office Action, p. 5. The Office action asserts that Doyle discloses these features. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In contrast to claim 1, there is no teaching or suggestion by Doyle of executing an interactive software application in a browser on a client computing system, the interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system. Doyle discloses interaction between a web browser client and a component embedded in the web browser client which may be, for example, a Java applet. The interaction between the web browser client and the component embedded in the web browser as disclosed in Doyle is distinctly different from an interactive software application and a browser being in communication with at least one element, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser (i.e., a different client side execution process) as claimed in independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 distinguishes over the combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 1 is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell fails to disclose wherein communication between the interactive software application and the at least one element does not pass through the client side firewall. Chopra fails to disclose a client side firewall. Doyle teaches communications between a client computer and other computers via a network which may be, for example, the Internet. Since the communication as disclosed in Doyle utilizes the Internet, the communication between the plurality of computers penetrates through a client side firewall. In contrast, the claimed invention discloses communications between an interactive software application and at least one element does not pass through a client side firewall. Brownell discloses a method and apparatus for managing network access to internal hosts protected by a firewall. A user on an external host logs into a firewall. Once the user has been authenticated to the firewall, a session is established for the user and tunnel data configuration data is transmitted to the user on the external host. However, Brownell fails to cure the deficiencies of Chopra and Doyle noted above. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 12 distinguishes over the combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 2-11 depend from and further restrict independent claim 1 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-11 distinguish over the cited combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-11 is respectfully requested.

Claims 16-18 depend from and further restrict independent claim 12 in a patentable sense. In rejecting claims 16-18, the Examiner has further applied Brownell. Brownell discloses a method and apparatus for managing network access to internal hosts protected by a firewall. Applicant respectfully submits that Brownell fails to cure the deficiencies of Chopra and Doyle noted above with respect to independent claim 12. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 12, dependent claims 16-18 distinguish over the cited combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell and are in

condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 16-18 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 19 relates to a method for providing security to a client computing system operating an interactive software application. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 19, namely, communicating data between at least one element and a browser on the client computing system, wherein the at least one element is outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system.

The Office action asserts that the cited combination of Chopra and Brownell fail to teach “the interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element outside the browser operating on the client computing system when executed and wherein at least one element includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system”. See Office Action, p. 3. The Office action asserts that Doyle discloses these features. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In contrast to claim 19, there is no teaching or suggestion by Doyle of executing an interactive software application in a browser on a client computing system, the interactive software application and the browser being in communication with at least one element, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system. Doyle discloses interaction between a web browser client and a component embedded in the web browser client which may be, for example, a Java applet. The interaction between the web browser client and the component embedded in the web browser as disclosed in Doyle is distinctly different from an interactive software application and a browser being in communication with at least one element, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser (i.e., a different client side execution process) as claimed in independent claim 19. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 19 distinguishes over the combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 19 is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell fails to disclose wherein communication between the interactive software application and the at least one element does not pass through the client side firewall. Chopra

fails to disclose a client side firewall. Doyle teaches communications between a client computer and other computers via a network which may be, for example, the Internet. Since the communication as disclosed in Doyle utilizes the Internet, it appears that the communication between the plurality of computers penetrates through a client side firewall. In contrast, the claimed invention discloses communications between an interactive software application and at least one element does not pass through a client side firewall. Brownell discloses a method and apparatus for managing network access to internal hosts protected by a firewall. A user on an external host logs into a firewall. Once the user has been authenticated to the firewall, a session is established for the user and tunnel data configuration data is transmitted to the user on the external host. However, Brownell fails to cure the deficiencies of Chopra and Doyle noted above. For this additional reason, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 19 distinguishes over the combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell and is in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of amended claim 19 is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25 depend from and further restrict independent claim 19 in a patentable sense. Applicant respectfully submits that, for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the rejection of independent claim 19, dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25 distinguish over the cited combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell and are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 26 relates to a system for providing security to a client computing system in communication with a host in communication with a host communication system across a network. Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell fails to teach, suggest, or render obvious at least one of the distinguishing features of independent claim 26, namely, means for executing an interactive software application in a browser on a client computing system, the interactive software application being in communication with at least one element on the client side of a client side firewall, and wherein the at least one element is outside the browser operating on the client computing system and includes a component of an underlying architecture of the client computing system. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination of Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell fails to disclose wherein communication between the interactive software application and the at least one element does not pass through the client side firewall. Additionally, Applicant submits that

claim 26 patentably distinguishes over Chopra, Doyle, and Brownell for similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to independent claims 1, 12, and 19.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated:

March 29, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By


Stanley R. Moore

Registration No.: 26,958

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3700

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant